Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 2 Part 3

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

Round II

Back < > Next

Quote: Sina
That is how I see you and all other hadith deniers. You do not like what you see in the hadith. They embarrass you. You find Muhammad torturing his victims, beheading them, gauging their eyes, raping them and doing all sorts of despicable acts and all that hurts. So instead of being honest and admit that you were wrong and the man whom you worship is a psychopath criminal, you try to dismiss all the hadiths. You think if you put your head in the sand and pretend you do not see; the problem will go away. The despicable lawyers of O.J. Simpson did that and they won. But does that mean that Mr. Simpson is innocent? Even if you win this case based on discrediting the evidence and technicalities, can you still live with your conscience?

Dear Sina:

Once I was a believer and defender of hadith. However, when I studied the history of hadith, its collection, procedures of its collection, and problems with their authenticity and the profound difference between hadith and the Quran, yes I witnessed this, I gave up from following hadith and sunnah.

I understand why you want me to drag to a source that I have come to refute at the cost of my life. You want me to revert back to my old days and start believing those sources that are mere hearsay. Here is my answer:

I WILL NOT ACCEPT YOUR INVITATION TO DIG INTO A LITERARY GARBAGE AND CHOOSE AND PICK WHATEVER WE LIKE AMONG THE THOUSANDS Of CONTRADICTORY AND OCCASIONALLY RIDICULOUS NARRATION.

It appears that you are not able to criticize the Quran without the help of adding some garbage from collections of hearsay.

On the contrary! I will show that the Quran is full of errors and absurdities and it can't be a book of revelation unless the revealer was Satan. The reason I want to clarify the question of

hadith is to demonstrate the fallacy of the position of those who totally deny them. Once that is established I will have no need for hadith.

> Muslims and non-Muslims, all agree that the historical authenticity of the Quran is far beyond the authenticity of hadith.

It is not true that everyone agrees that the Quran is more authentic than the hadith. Here is a study that disagrees with that claim:

http://www.derafsh-kaviyani.com/english/quran1.html

> Thus, your insistence to rely on hadith, by a biased criterion of "if it says something good about prophet we will reject it but if it says bad things about him we jump over and accept it." is unacceptable. It is unfair; it is dishonest.

I already responded to this in my example of police and tips from the public. It would be dishonest to disregard all those tips. No investigator would do such thing unless he is trying to cover up.

You want us to throw all the incriminating evidence against Muhammad just because some of those stories my not be true. The mere fact that some of them are fabricated is not enough reason to discard all of them. You have to do more than that to discredit them all. For example let us talk about the motive.

People do not lie unless there is a motive. What was the motive of those who reported these hadiths?

Sycophantism is a motive. People lie to endear themselves. They falsely attribute miracles to their cult leader because they find receptive audience among fellow believers. This makes them feel important and validates their ego. This is very typical in cults where the cult leader is elevated superlatively by his cronies and each tries to fabricate a lie to make the cult leader look bigger and holier, both during his life time and after his death. A good example is John de Ruiter, the self appointed "Messiah" who has orgies with two young sisters with the consent and gratitude of their parents even though he is married.

A few years ago in my neighborhood market, I saw his flyer pinned to the billboard. It was an invitation to his conferences with these words:

“John de Ruiter: Master of transformation; living embodiment and teacher of Truth.__”

And;

“Through the living essence of Truth emanating from his words and from his presence, John de Ruiter awakens what our hearts most long for…”

Any sane person can see that this self proclaimed "guru of the gurus" is insane. But that is not what his followers see. I can bring multitude of examples such as these where the followers of cults become blind and try to fabricate an unreal image of their leader. The point here is that such narrations from the befogged followers of cults should not be taken seriously. So when we see hadiths that attribute miracles to Muhammad we should discard them or at least the part containing the miracles. Also attributing miracles to Muhammad contradicts the Quran.

We see Muhammad shrugging his shoulder when people ask for miracles. He said "*There came to you messengers before me, with clear Signs and even with what ye ask for: why then did ye slay them, if ye speak the truth*?"3:138 Or: *"Glory to my Lord! Am I aught but a man,- a messenger?"* Q.17:93. We see this denial that he can perform any miracles in many verses of the Quran (25:7,8 17: 95) People called him mad and possessed and asked "*Why do you not bring to us the angels if you are of the truthful ones?* Q15:7 His response was: "*We send not the angels down except for just cause* Q.15:8 In another place we read "*"And the Unbelievers say: "Why is not a sign sent down to him from his Lord?" But thou art truly a warner, and to every people a guide."* Q.13:7 His contention was that even with clear signs people rejected the prophets so the miracles are useless. Q.3:184

Therefore if the Quran is right then all the miracles attributed to Muhammad in the hadiths are fabricated.

It is clear why the believers fabricate false stories to make their cult leader look grand. But why would they lie to make him look like a villain? We have stories about Muhammad raiding innocent unarmed people with no warning, massacring and looting them, enslaving their wives and children and raping them, torturing people to make them reveal the whereabouts of their treasures, branding their eyes with hot red iron and then raping their wives on the same day. There are stories about him beheading in cold blood 750 innocent men who had surrendered to him without a fight when he blockaded their quarter and diverted the flow of the water to their town. We have hadiths that say he assassinated his opponents including a 120 year old man and a mother of five small children only because they composed poetries criticizing them.

These hadiths are confirmed in the books of history (Siras). They come to us from a variety of sources. They vary in detail but are consistent in the main theme which is normal when a story is reported by several people. There are names of the people involved. They do not seem to be fabrications because of the amount of details.

The main question is WHY? Why would devout followers who loved their prophet report so many false stories about him that portray him as a criminal, mass murderer, rapist, pedophile, assassin, deceiver, and a highway robber?

The motive is important. We can see a clear motive why people fabricate lies to make their prophet look holy but what motive could they have to lie about their prophet and make him look so evil?

We could also overlook such hadiths if they were just a few. Someone could have been an enemy in disguise and might have lied. But we have thousands upon thousands of hadiths that tell the same tale of brutality and portray Muhammad as a criminal. At the same time we have no other version of the same events. If Muhammad actually did not raid the innocent populations how they converted to Islam? Do we have a different version of how Islam expanded? Why would so many devout believers who waged wars for Islam and gave their lives fabricate so many falsehoods against their prophet? Why would dedicated scholars such as Ibh Ishaq, Tabari, Waqidi, Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Hisham, Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud, Malik or others spend an entire life writing books based on nothing but lies? What happened to the "real" history of Muhammad? How come not a single version of that was ever written? And all what is survived are lies? If all these people were liars, where were the truthful scholars of Islam? How can it be that for 1300 years all the Muslims were lying and suddenly when they came in contact with the West and were embarrassed to see their religion is barbaric in comparison to the humanistic values of the Westerners they discovered that the history of Muhammad that they have is all lies?

Your position of denial is absurd and untenable. You are shocked by the sheer inhumanity of Muhammad, but you are not capable to let go. You try to cling to him desperately but you mask the truth, lie to yourself and cocooned in your leis you feel safe. By these denials you are not changing the truth. You are simply sugarcoating the bitter truth so you can swallow it easier. You are simply beguiling yourself.